REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated September 26, 2007. A Request for Continued Examiner is filed herewith. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney Dave Dagg at (617) 630-1131 to schedule a telephone interview in order to discuss the distinctions of the present claims over the cited references.

Claim 1 stands rejected for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), citing United States patent number 6,697,840 of Godefroid et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in the previous response, a user of the Godefroid et al. system can explicitly update his or her presence information by logging in or logging out. Godefroid et al. further disclose that the user interface sends messages to the rest of a presence awareness system indicating login, logout, screensaver(on), and screensaver(off) events (column 5, lines 15-18).

Nowhere in Godefroid et al. is there disclosed or suggested any system or method of providing a user status message in an instant messaging system, including:

. . .

> adding said new entry to said user status message, wherein said adding said new entry includes inserting a time at which said new entry was added into said user status message, *wherein said adding said new entry to said user status message further includes adding said new entry to a plurality of previous entries maintained within said user status message, wherein said new entry and said previous entries together provide an editing history of said status message to other users*. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. In contrast, Godefroid et al. disclose a system in which the user's presence information is automatically *updated* in response to explicit events, such as user logins and logouts. Nothing in Godefroid et al. provides any hint or suggestion of

even the desirability of providing any kind of status message that *includes a plurality of entries that provide an editing history of the status message to other users*, as in the present independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, independent claim 1 distinguishes over <u>Godefroid et al.</u> Applicants accordingly respectfully urge that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 7 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on <u>Godefroid et al.</u> Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 7 recites a system of providing a user status message in an instant messaging system, including:

. . .

> means for adding said new entry to said user status message, wherein said adding said new entry includes inserting a time at which said new entry was added into said user status message, *wherein said adding said new entry to said user status message further includes adding said new entry to a plurality of previous entries maintained within said user status message, wherein said new entry and said previous entries together provide an editing history of said status message to other users*. (emphasis added)

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of <u>Godefroid et al.</u> set forth above, <u>Godefroid et al.</u> does not anticipate the system of claim 7, including the status message that *includes a plurality of entries that provide an editing history of the status message to other users*.

In view of the foregoing, claim 7 patentably distinguishes over <u>Godefroid et al.</u> Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on <u>Godefroid et al.</u> be withdrawn.

Independent claim 13 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on <u>Godefroid et al.</u> Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 13 recites a computer program product including a computer readable medium having a computer program for providing a user status message in an instant messaging system stored thereon, the computer program including:

. . .

> program code for adding said new entry to said user status message, wherein said adding said new entry includes inserting a time at which said new entry was added into said user status message, ***wherein said adding said new entry to said user status message further includes adding said new entry to a plurality of previous entries maintained within said user status message, wherein said new entry and said previous entries together provide an editing history of said status message to other users***. (emphasis added)

For reasons that also should be clear from the discussion of <u>Godefroid et al.</u> set forth above, <u>Godefroid et al.</u> does not anticipate the computer program product of claim 13, including the status message that *includes a plurality of entries that provide an editing history of the status message to other users.*

In view of the foregoing, claim 13 also patentably distinguishes over <u>Godefroid et al.</u> Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on <u>Godefroid et al.</u> be withdrawn.

In addition, independent claim 19 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on <u>Godefroid et al.</u> Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 19 recites a computer system including a computer readable memory having program code for providing a user status message in an instant messaging system stored thereon, the program code including:

> . . .

> program code operable to add said new entry to said user status message, wherein said adding said new entry includes inserting a time at which said new entry was added into said user status message, ***wherein said adding said new entry to said user status message further includes adding said new entry to a plurality of previous entries maintained within said user status message, wherein said new entry and said previous entries together provide an editing history of said status message to other users***. (emphasis added)

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Godefroid et al. above, Godefroid et al. also does not anticipate the computer system of claim 19, including the status message that *includes a plurality of entries that provide an editing history of the status message to other users.* Claim 19 therefore patentably distinguishes over Godefroid et al., and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on Godefroid et al. be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 15 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, based on the combination of Godefroid et al. and Pyra Labs ("Blogger"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As noted in the previous response, Blogger discloses a system for creating Web pages referred to as "blogs" that are made up of chronologically arranged "posts". Like Godefroid et al., Blogger includes no teaching or suggestion regarding even a need for providing any kind of *status message* that *includes a plurality of entries that provide an editing history of the status message to other users*, as in the present independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Godefroid et al. and Blogger does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims. Accordingly, the combination of Godefroid et al. and Blogger does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the present independent claims, and dependent claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 15 are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Godefroid et al. and Blogger for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 4-6, 10, 11, and 16-18 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, based on Godefroid et al. and "Blogger", additionally combined with "Creation of Web Pages for the Internet" of Byford ("Byford"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in the previous response, <u>Byford</u> discloses a system for inserting words or text intended to act as hypertext in a paper page, and for recording URLs at the bottom of the page that match each link. A scanner and software are then used in <u>Byford</u> to produce and process digital input to produce Web pages. Like both <u>Godefroid et al.</u> and <u>Blogger</u>, <u>Byford</u> includes no teaching or suggestion regarding even a need for providing any kind of *status message* that *includes a plurality of entries that provide an editing history of the status message to other users,* as in the present independent claims. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the combination of <u>Godefroid et al.</u>, <u>Blogger</u> and <u>Byford</u> does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims. Accordingly, the combination of <u>Godefroid et al.</u>, <u>Blogger</u> and <u>Byford</u> does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the present independent claims, and dependent claims 4-6, 10, 11, and 16-18 are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of <u>Godefroid et al.</u>, <u>Blogger</u> and <u>Byford</u> for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

__December 23, 2007__   _____/David Dagg/_____
Date   David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
                                           Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
                                           McGuinness & Manaras LLP
                                           125 Nagog Park
                                           Acton, MA 01720
                                           (617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-012